

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## EVALUATION OF THE UNICEF BELARUS CHILD RIGHTS MONITORING PROGRAMME (2016-2022)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	79%	Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●-	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●●--	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●-- --	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	EVALUATION OF THE UNICEF BELARUS CHILD RIGHTS MONITORING PROGRAMME (2016-2022)
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Belarus 66-2024-19412
<b>Region</b>	ECAR
<b>Year of report</b>	2023
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Belarus
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Belarus
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	20-21 June 2024
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	UNICEF managed
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>	
Every child survives and thrives	Yes
Every child learns	Yes
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Programme
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Formative
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Output & Outcome
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 16,17

**EQA Summary:** *The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.*

### Strengths:

- The report is well structured and clearly references annexed materials for further details. The report is largely well written, jargon free, and is accessible to a wide audience.
- The evaluation report provides a sufficiently detailed description of the context of the CRMP, including the status and needs of rightsholders, and links the CRMP to the SDGs.
- The evaluation report clearly states the evaluation purpose, scope, objectives, 'why now', intended use and intended users.
- The evaluation report provides visual representations of the different iterations of the ToC, including the original, the revised ToC from the evaluability assessment and the further revised ToC created during the evaluation.

### Weaknesses:

- The report does not sufficiently define how 'evidence harvesting' was used during data collection.
- The findings do not always clearly indicate the accompanying supporting evidence.
- Lessons learned do not contain sufficient detail to be useful and lesson 2 appears to be based on an assumption.
- The recommendations do not fully align with the evaluation purpose. The purpose of the evaluation included providing insights on how to address possible system-level bottlenecks and strengthen the national CRMS and accountability mechanisms. While there are recommendations that would strengthen the national CRMS if carried out, there are no recommendations that address system-level bottlenecks or that would strengthen the national accountability mechanisms.
- The reviewer has concern around the appropriateness of the recommendation to have GOB (national stakeholders) utilize external data generated by international agencies as this may not be appropriate given a finding under the sustainability criterion which stated that only administrative data generated by ministries and Belstat can be used for official decision making as it is guided by respective regulations and controlled by governmental agencies.
- Data collection tools and accompanying informed consent processes are not included as annexes.

**Recommendations for Improvement:** *The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.*

The single major shortcoming in this evaluation report is the inconsistent citations/references. The report should have more systematically cited supporting evidence in the findings section. As written, it is unclear what supporting evidence undergirds many findings.

The evaluation employed what it referred to as 'evidence harvesting' (section 4.4). The report states that this approach was based on outcome harvesting, although the specifics of how this method was carried out during the evaluation is not described in detail. Without further details regarding how evidence harvesting was carried out in practice, it is unclear whether a truly innovative practice was utilized. More details on the methodology should have been included in the final report, and based on actual implementation (i.e., not solely the description offered in the inception report).

The three lessons learned would have benefitted from a review and revision. Lesson 2 appears to make an assumption based on the findings and uses the word 'may', so it is not fully anchored in the evidence. Further, lesson 2 would have benefitted from more details as it does not address what 'more welcomed' means in terms of the different national stakeholders' opinions of the support. Alternatively, lesson 2 could have been revised to simply state that UNICEF support is welcomed by national stakeholders when it helps them achieve their own intended results (i.e., remove 'more welcomed by national stakeholders').

The recommendations should be revised to ensure that they fully align with the evaluation purpose. The purpose of the evaluation included providing insights on how to address possible system-level bottlenecks and strengthen the national CRMS and accountability mechanisms. While there are recommendations that would strengthen the national CRMS if carried out, there are no recommendations that address system-level bottlenecks or that would strengthen the national accountability mechanisms.

Data collection tools and accompanying informed consent processes should be included as annexes.

SECTION RATINGS		
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	83%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 1.</b>	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	

	i	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users' (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	The executive summary is clearly presented and just slightly over 5 pages in length. However, the executive summary lacks the required depth to serve as a standalone document for key users to make informed decisions. As an example, the lessons learned only include the headline/title of the lessons learned. The executive summary could have provided a more concise description of the methodology (e.g., 2-3 paragraphs) and included more details on the lessons learned.
	ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	The executive summary includes all necessary elements listed under this criterion.
	iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Yes	The executive summary provides a sufficiently detailed summary of the CRMP and the evaluation itself. It does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>			93%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 2.</b>		Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The information presented in Section 2, Annex 2 and Annex 3 provide a clear, relevant and comprehensive description of CRMP interventions including timing, budget/cost, locations (if applicable/not national) and implementation status is clear.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	Section 2 clearly states that the CRMP 'directly targeted only duty-bearers involved in data production and use'. The report lists the Government of Belarus at large as well as Belstat and line ministries as those responsible for data production and use. Other duty bearers included UN agencies and other development actors. The report states that children are the right-holders who are 'expected to benefit from better realization of their rights as a result of improved availability of data and better decision-making based on this data'.  The level of detail provided on the intended rightsholders and duty bearers is appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation.
<b>Question 3.</b>		Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	Section 2 provides a comprehensive overview of how the CRMP is situated within the socio-economic, political, institutional, and international context of Belarus. It clearly links the intervention's objectives to broader policy frameworks and international efforts, identifies implementation challenges, and discusses collaborative efforts with various stakeholders.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	The report is clear that the CRMP contributes to SDG reporting. Specific targets and indicators are not referenced, but clear linkages are drawn to the SDGs. The report does note 21 SDG indicators reported against as part of MICS6, but does not list each one individually. The link between SDG monitoring and reporting and the CRMP is clear.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	Section 2.3.1 discusses the social, economic and political developments affecting the realization of children's rights, which includes some discussion around the current status and needs of the rightsholders (children). The report does not reflect on the availability of data on children in Belarus, outside of stating that the country meets approximately 80% of SDG targets (generally). The report would have benefited from inclusion of additional key statistics on the status of children in Belarus to give a fuller picture of the lived experiences of children in the country. For example, data from the SDG Belarus child well-being webpage ( <a href="https://data.unicef.org/sdgs/country/blr/">https://data.unicef.org/sdgs/country/blr/</a> ) may have been useful to create 1-2 paragraphs further detailing children's lived experiences in the country.
<b>Question 4.</b>		Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	The report provides a narrative description of the various stakeholders and linkages between them in Section 2. These include UNICEF as the implementing agency, Belstat as the key partner, other UN agencies/development partners who provide support in various development areas including data collection and analysis, right holders (children) and other duty bearers such as the Government of Belarus and its line ministries that gather, process and report administrative data related to child welfare and rights.  Annex 2 gives additional details regarding the operating environment. Annex 3 details the specific CRMP interventions alongside leading agency(ies), engagement with other national partners/contractors and international partners, engagement mechanisms, and results owners.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The report is clear regarding the roles of key stakeholders. Specific interventions and their associated expenditures are displayed in Table 1. Annex 2 provides additional details on these interventions including a more detailed description and outputs alongside responsible partners. Annex 3 provides additional information on CRMP interventions including their partners, engagement mechanisms and results owners.
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>			100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 5.</b>		Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	Section 3.1 details the purpose of the evaluation, answers the 'why now' question, details the intended uses of the findings as well as the key intended primary and secondary users.
<b>Question 6.</b>		Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		

	i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	<p>Sections 3.1 to 3.3 detail the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. There are no references to any changes made to the objectives in the ToR. The reviewer notes that there is a small change in the objectives presented in the ToR and the final report. This small change does not change the overall objective and, as such, the reviewer has marked this criterion as 'yes'.</p> <p><b>ToR:</b> To draw lessons and provide recommendations for the refinement of good practices and new actions to: further support the national government in its efforts of strengthening the national child monitoring system.</p> <p><b>Final report:</b> To draw lessons and provide recommendations for refining good practices and new actions to: further support the GOB in its efforts to strengthen the national CRMS and monitoring child-related SDG indicators.</p>
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	<p>Section 3 of the evaluation report provides a clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation including the temporal scope, sectoral coverage, geographic coverage and thematic coverage. There is one change from the scope detailed in the ToR to the scope presented in the inception report and the final report. The final report does not note a reason for this change.</p> <p><b>ToR:</b> Thematic coverage: The evaluation will cover national child rights monitoring initiatives with a focus on creating evidence for informed decision-making including data collection (population surveys), analysis of research results, data presentation and distribution, capacity development activities.</p> <p><b>Inception report and final report:</b> Thematic coverage: The evaluation covered national CRM initiatives with a focus on creating evidence for informed decision-making including data collection (population surveys), analysis of research results, data presentation and distribution, capacity development activities. The evaluation did not cover studies undertaken by UNICEF outside of the "Monitoring, knowledge generation and alliance-building for child rights" component of the Country Programme.</p>
<b>Question 7.</b>		<b>Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?</b>		
	i		Yes	<p>The report states that during the inception phase, the evaluation team developed a more detailed ToC explicitly showing connections between types of implemented activities and intended results. Per the final report, 'the reconstructed ToC and causal links of how specific activities translate into specific outputs, outcomes, and/or impacts are discussed in detail in the Key Findings section.'</p> <p>Within the findings section, the report details which intended results were being tested by the evaluation.</p>
	ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	Yes	Section 2.2 presents a visual representation of the ToC.
	iii	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Yes	The ToC was assessed as part of the evaluation and a more detailed ToC was created by the evaluators.
<b>SECTION D:</b>		<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 8.</b>		Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions are appropriate for fulfilling the purpose of the evaluation (assessing CRMP results to date including analysing strengths and weaknesses in CRMP strategies and to provide insights on how to address possible system-level bottlenecks and strengthen the national CRMS and accountability mechanisms). The evaluation questions are also appropriate for meeting the objectives of the evaluation listed in section 3.2 of the final report.
	ii	In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	Yes	In addition to evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix includes evidence/indicators, data sources and data collection methods from which the analysis and be based on and conclusions drawn.
<b>Question 9.</b>		Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		

	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, and are fully and clearly described.	Partially	The evaluation design and set of methods are described in section 4 of the final report. However, the description of evidence harvesting (based on outcome harvesting) is not sufficiently described. It is unclear how the team employed this method and more details are required in order to determine its adequacy or robustness. The evaluation design (detailed in section 4.4) and set of methods (document review and semi-structured interviews) are relevant to the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope. Interview guides are not annexed to the final report, so the robustness of these methods cannot be determined by the reviewer. Section 4.6 states that data was collected through review of relevant documentation and interviews (virtual and face-to-face) with relevant stakeholders. Annex 3 provides information on the data collection methods used to answer each of the evaluation questions. The report also provides sufficient detail regarding the data analysis methods in section 4.7.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation largely uses qualitative sources, but also makes use of some key statistics. The sources of data are clearly described and are appropriate for the scope of the evaluation.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The sampling strategy for CRMP interventions to be included under the evaluation is clearly detailed in section 4.5. The section details the key criteria used to select the interventions. This criteria included whether the intervention addressed data gaps related to the most vulnerable groups.  Based on the selection criteria for the selection of interventions, diverse perspectives including from the 2018 Disability Survey and the Rapid needs assessments during migration crisis in 2021 were included.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Section 4.7 clearly details the data analysis process. This included triangulation of data sources, methodological triangulation and triangulation between perspectives of evaluators.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for drawing causal links between outputs and outcomes. Section 4.7 details how causal connections between outputs, outcomes and impact were made – through analysis of responses to two interview questions with line ministry representatives: 1) if and how outputs of CRMP interventions, especially surveys and research reports, were used for decision-making; and 2) if and how the decisions translated into better outcomes for children. The evaluation team then triangulated these answers with government documents/policies to the extent possible.
vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	No	Section 4.9 details the limitations faced by the evaluation and explains how these limitations were mitigated/addressed by the evaluators (as feasible). For example, one limitation was that some key informants were based outside of Belarus. With support from the CO, the evaluators contacted these individuals virtually to ensure that their perspectives were included. Further, the limitation of available and knowledgeable key informants was mitigated by reviewing available documents and publications during the timeframe of the evaluation (2016-2022). A second limitation of the evaluation was the fact that no baseline assessment of the state of the national CRMS existed. This limitation was mitigated inasmuch as was possible by reconstructing the baseline state of the CRMS via interviews. However, this remains a limitation of the evaluation as the evaluation team was unable to fully reconstruct the baseline state of the CRMS.  That said, the limitations section appears to contradict a finding under 'efficiency'. The limitations section claims that the CRMP interventions were well-documented and allowed for the evaluation team to mitigate any negative effects of staff or former staff unavailability. However, the finding under efficiency states that the evaluation team was unable to access documents related to implementation of CRMP interventions. It is unclear how the statement that the CRMP interventions were well-documented and that the evaluation team was unable to access documents regulating implementation of CRMP interventions. It is unclear how the evaluation team determined the CRMP interventions were well documented without access to these documents.
<b>Question 10.</b>	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	No	The report references the UNEG guidelines, but does not provide explicit and contextualized reference to the obligations of evaluators and the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Partially	The report notes that the evaluation approach was guided by UNEG Norms and Standards and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The report does not detail the informed consent process for informants. The report would have benefitted from including summary of how informed consent was sought and other ethical safeguards were enacted in section 4.8.  The evaluation did not involve children as sources of information.
<b>Question 11.</b>	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	No	The evaluation employed what it referred to as 'evidence harvesting' (section 4.4). The report states that this approach was based on outcome harvesting, although the specifics of how this method was carried out during the evaluation is not described in detail. Without further details, it is unclear whether a truly innovative practice was utilized.
<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>		83%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 12.</b>	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		

i	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Partially	<p>Findings are organized per evaluation question, are detailed and contain evidence that systematically addresses each of the evaluation's questions. However, throughout the findings, the authors do not systematically provide sources for statements made. An example follows, but this was present throughout the entirety of the findings section. The findings section should have contained footnotes or in-text references to the specific supporting evidence. For example, if specific documentation supported a statement, this should have been footnoted. If the finding had been triangulated by interviews, then this should also have been noted.</p> <p>An example of finding that appears to have evidence to support it, but does not provide any sources for the supporting evidence: 'Belstat and line ministries as main national stakeholders of CRMP were closely involved in the design and implementation of major CRMP interventions. For example, all decisions about the content and architecture of the Child Statistics Portal were made by an inter-agency working group including representatives of Belstat, MoE, MoLSP, MoH, Ministry of Interior, and UN agencies. A similar group managed the development of the Gender Statistics Portal.' (Page 33.)</p> <p>The reviewer notes one finding that appears to be contradicted by other information in the report. A finding related to Q1.1 states that: 'Most of CRMP interventions did not have explicit focus on a specific vulnerable group or groups of children (Annex 7). Only the rapid needs assessments of migrants during migration crisis in 2021 was directly aimed at one of the vulnerable groups – child migrants.' However, Annex 8 displays the scope of CRMP Interventions and if they targeted specific vulnerable groups of children. Within the table in Annex 8, there is the disability survey (2018) as well as child poverty and commitment to equity for children research projects that focused on specific vulnerable groups. Further, conclusion 3 appears to contradict this finding as well. It is unclear why the finding stated that only the rapid needs assessments of migrants was directly aimed at one of the vulnerable groups when CRMP interventions also included research in children with disabilities as well as children from low-income families.</p>
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The findings include an assessment of the validity of the CRMP's ToC. The ToC was used to develop the evaluation questions and the evaluation questions form the basis of the findings. As such, the CRMP's ToC was explicitly used in the formulation of the findings.
<b>Question 13.</b> Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.			
i	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Partially	The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data (e.g., list of documents in Annex 5 and the list of key informants in Annex 6). The findings includes outcome-level findings but does not clearly address outputs per the original ToC and the ToC following the evaluability assessment which was 'national capacity to reveal and monitor bottlenecks in realization of CR strengthened'. The data analysis methodology states that triangulation was undertaken whenever possible. However, the findings do not always reference the supporting evidence so it is difficult to see where triangulation was undertaken. There are some instances where the evaluation team is clear that supporting evidence was not triangulated (e.g., a finding under Q 5.1: 'The evaluation did not find much evidence of CRMP leading to any substantial impact on child rights protection. According to MoH, the results of the Disability Survey informed decisions to expand infrastructure and services for children with developmental disorders: the government opened rehabilitation centres, increased the number of neurological departments in hospitals and introduced early screening programs. This information was not confirmed by other data sources.')
ii	Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	Findings clearly link to the evidence presented (i.e. are supported by and respond to the evidence) and includes both positive and negative aspects discovered during data collection. The evaluation questions do not require that the findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards or benchmarks. However, the findings are based on the indicators listed in the evaluation matrix and tie to the reconstructed theory of change.
iii	Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The findings highlight causal factors that led to the achievement or non-achievement of results (e.g., low government capacity for making use of products produced under the CRMP). For example, the evaluation team found little evidence that increased amount of CRM data and easier access to it translated into evidence-based decisions. The causal factor influencing this included the fact that 'only administrative data generated by ministries and Belstat can be used for official decision making as it is guided by respective regulations and controlled by governmental agencies'. Additionally, the findings included an assessment of the ToC including reasons for why certain components were/were not valid.
<b>Question 14.</b> Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?			
i	Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	The findings provide assessments of the adequacy of selected interventions' monitoring systems and their abilities to support decision-making.
<b>SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>		63%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 15.</b> Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?			
i	Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	Conclusions reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Conclusion 4 is forward looking. While the sentence structure could have been edited for improved clarity, the judgements contained in each conclusion are clear.
ii	Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	Conclusions are anchored in the findings and highlight both strengths and weaknesses of the CRMP. Conclusion 2 adds insight and analysis beyond the findings. The other conclusions are simply summaries of findings.
<b>Question 16.</b> Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]			

	i	Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	Partially	The three lessons learned stem logically from the findings. However, lesson 2 appears to make an assumption based on the findings and uses the word 'may', so it is not fully anchored in the evidence. Each of the three lessons have wider applicability and relevance beyond the CRMP.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The three lessons are concisely presented (approximately one paragraph per lesson). Lessons 1 and 3 have sufficient detail to be useful. However, lesson 2 would have benefited from more details as it does not address what 'more welcomed' means in terms of the different national stakeholders' opinions of the support. Alternatively, lesson 2 could have been revised to simply state that UNICEF support is welcomed by national stakeholders when it helps them achieve their own intended results (i.e., remove 'more welcomed by national stakeholders').
<b>SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>			88%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 17.</b>		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partially	The recommendations somewhat align with the evaluation purpose. The purpose of the evaluation included providing insights on how to address possible system-level bottlenecks and strengthen the national CRMS and accountability mechanisms. While there are recommendations that would strengthen the national CRMS if carried out, there are no recommendations that address system-level bottlenecks or that would strengthen the national accountability mechanisms.  Further, it appears that the recommendation to have GOB (national stakeholders) utilize external data generated by international agencies may not be appropriate given a finding under the sustainability criterion which stated that only administrative data generated by ministries and Belstat can be used for official decision making as it is guided by respective regulations and controlled by governmental agencies.
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	Overall, the recommendations provide some useful suggestions and guidance for implementation for the CO to carry forth.  The recommendations section notes where some suggested activities may not be viable (e.g., recommendation 5). The recommendations are worded in a way that is actionable for the CO. In other words, where the recommended action itself is beyond the control of the CO, the report uses language like 'explore the opportunity to'. Where recommended actions are within the control of the CO, actionable language is largely used. Some headline findings could have been worded more clearly and succinctly, and in a more actionable way. Context around justifying the recommendation as well as details on how to operationalize each of the recommendation could then be presented in the body of each recommendation. As written, the headline findings are difficult to easily digest (e.g., recommendation 2, recommendation 4, recommendation 5).  While not specific to this criterion, the reviewer notes that there appears to be a disconnect between the headline recommendations and the recommendations in the body of the text under recommendation 1: The headline recommendation under recommendation 1 relates to a focus on analysis of CRM data with the aim to identify specific groups of children facing particular challenges to inform actionable solutions to solve these problems and links this recommendation to conclusions 1 and 2.  However, the body text of recommendation 1 relates to the lack of culture of evidence-based decision- and policymaking in the government, and the recommendation that the ToC be revised to explicitly include the lack of the culture of evidence-based decision- and policymaking as one of the major challenges to be addressed. Further, the recommendation includes suggesting that the CO include detailed change path in the ToC to promote the use of CRMP data to better characterize and capture the needs of the most vulnerable groups of children to develop and advocate for actionable solutions with the GOB.  As such, there is a disconnect between the headline recommendation and the recommendations in the body of the text under recommendation 1.
	iii	Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	Yes	Section 7 describes the process for developing recommendations which included duty bearers. The evaluation report was clear earlier on in the document that rights holders (children) were not included.
<b>Question 18.</b>		Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i	Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	The recommendations section clearly states that the recommendations aim to guide and support the CO in further enhancing its CRM efforts. The evaluation team also urges the CO to consider and discuss the evaluation recommendations with the national partners (as feasible) for planning and implementing them in the next programme cycle. As such, all recommendations are directed at the same group - the CO. The recommendations would have benefited from providing more details on which departments or groups within the CO were responsible for each action, but since all are directed at the CO, the report meets this criterion. The recommendations are prioritized as either low, medium or high.
<b>SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>			79%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 19.</b>		Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Partially	The opening pages include 7 of the 8 required items. The opening pages is missing the timeframe of the evaluation.
	ii	Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Partially	The report meets 5 of the 7 required annexes. The report does not contain a list of site visits or the data collection instruments. Additional annexes include details on specific CRMP interventions (annexes 2, 3, 8 and 9), data on vulnerable groups and corresponding national indicators (annex 7).

<b>Question 20.</b>	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The structure is easy to navigate with a table of contents that utilizes hyperlinks for easier navigation. The sections are numbered and the report uses clear titles and subtitles. The report is well formatted.
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The report accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports. The background/context precedes the purpose, objectives and scope. The report then explains the methodology, provides evaluation findings, then conclusions and lessons learned and, lastly, recommendations.
<b>Question 21.</b>	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	The report is of reasonable length (46 pages) and does not exceed the number of pages specified in the ToR (60 pages).
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The report is generally easy to understand and is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors. There are some instances where sentence structure could be improved and a final copyedit/proofread may have caught these instances (e.g., missing articles like 'a', 'an', 'the' and missing prepositions). There are also some areas where it appears that tracked changes may have been accepted without a proofread afterwards (e.g., instances of odd punctuation mid-sentence such as 'outputs, outcomes and impact, , the evaluation team...' Recommendation 4 also contains and incomplete sentence ('The evaluation team recommends'). That said, most of these small errors do not negatively impact the reader's ability to comprehend the information. There is also some language in the recommendations section that makes the recommendation difficult to understand: Recommendation 4: 'The evaluation team recommends the CO to continue this practice and to explore opportunities of conducting such surveys or adding respective boosters with Belstat and other line ministries, first of all, MoE and MoLSP responsible for different dimensions of child well-being in Belarus.' However, even with this difficult-to-understand sentence, the larger recommendation itself is easily understood (to add booster samples to surveys). As first stated, the report is easy to understand and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report frequently uses visual aids such as tables, graphs and figures. These are clearly labelled/presented and referenced in the text.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	81%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 22.</b>	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	The report references relevant human rights instruments (e.g., CRPD, CRC) and highlights the use of UNEG ethical guidelines in the conduct of the evaluation.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	Section 4 details the level of participation of key duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (children – the rights holders – were not included in the evaluation). Activities described in Section 4 included meetings with evaluation stakeholders to refine the evaluation questions, meetings with CO staff and national stakeholders during an inception mission to Minsk, virtual consultations with key M&E stakeholders, consultations with the CO and ECARO evaluation specialists to produce the evaluation brief and inception report, and feedback from CO and ECARO evaluation specialists on the draft evaluation report.  An ERG was established as part of the evaluability assessment which took place prior to the evaluation. However, the report states in Section 4 that the ERG was dismissed due to issues related to member availability, lack of suitable replacements, procedural constraints within the Government, and the need to ensure timely completion of the evaluation with adequate stakeholder input. Instead, the evaluation team opted to engage directly with national stakeholders. They informed them about the evaluation process and involved representatives from national partners in providing expertise and recommendations through interviews and other contributions to the data collection process.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	The report uses language that is empowering and inclusive. Throughout the report, the terminology of rights holders and duty bearers is used. Where data allows for disaggregation, this is highlighted. Due to the topic of the evaluation, discussing differential results in the data collected under CRMP is not applicable.
	iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Yes	Question 1.1 explores to what extent CRMP considered interests of vulnerable groups of children. Question 3.4 assesses the extent to which principles of gender equality and Leave No Child Behind were effectively mainstreamed and delivered by CRMP interventions.
<b>Question 23.</b>	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	5	

	<p>i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.</p>	<p>Fully integrated</p>	<p>The evaluation assesses whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results. The evaluation mainstreams human rights and gender equality considerations within all of its objectives. Similarly, gender and human rights were mainstreamed in all evaluation criteria. In addition to integrating GEEW within multiple evaluation questions, Q 3.4 is dedicated to determining the extent to which principles of gender equality and Leave no Child Behind were effectively mainstreamed and delivered by CRMP interventions.</p>
	<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p>	<p>Partially integrated</p>	<p>The evaluation employed a mixed-methods approach which is appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations. The evaluation utilized a range of data sources and processes to help guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility (e.g., through triangulation, validation). The sampling frame included a selection criterion related to whether the intervention addressed data gaps related to the most vulnerable groups.</p> <p>However, without access to the data collection tools, the reviewer cannot comment on the extent to which the tools were gender-responsive. The evaluation investigated the extent to which the sampled interventions allowed for disaggregation by sex. The data collected by the evaluation team was not disaggregated by sex. The methodology section did not sufficiently describe how data collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Further, without access to the data collection instruments and associated informed consent process, the reviewer cannot comment on whether ethical standards were considered throughout the evaluation and confirm that all stakeholder groups were treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality. That said, the evaluation report clearly states that UNEG ethical guidelines were followed.</p>
	<p>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p>	<p>Partially integrated</p>	<p>The evaluation includes reference to intersectional analyses of specific groups of children and references relevant instruments related to human rights and gender equality (e.g., CRPD). The findings include data analyses that includes disaggregated data (as available). The evaluation did not interview individuals of different social role groups, so triangulation of these voices was not possible. There were no unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality (note that the evaluation question on unintended effects was not selected as part of the evaluation due to the low ERG rating during the evaluability assessment). The evaluation report provides specific recommendations that address the most vulnerable groups of children, which could have connections to GEWE issues, but gender equality was not explicitly mentioned in the recommendations section.</p>

**SWAP Rating Guidance**

<p><b>i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.</b></p> <p>a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</b></p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p><b>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</b></p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>